



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/755,627	01/12/2004	Kevin C. McCarthy	DON01 P-1136	1704
28101	7590 02/07/2006		EXAMINER	
	E, GARDNER, LINN	LOUIS JACQUES, JACQUES H		
2851 CHARLEVOIX DRIVE, S.E. P.O. BOX 888695			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	APIDS, MI 49588-8695		3661	
			DATE MAILED: 02/07/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/755,627	MCCARTHY ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
•	Jacques H. Louis-Jacques	3661				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILII - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, b Any reply received by the Office later than three months after th earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply b ion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for the cause the application to become ABANDO	e timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		·				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed or	12 January 2004.					
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐	This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for a	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>62-196</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>62-196</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers	Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection	to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
,						
Attachment(s)	4) Interview Sum	mary (PTO-413)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) X Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO	5) Notice of Infon 6) Other:	mal Patent Application (PTO-152)				
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>01/12/04</u> .	0)					

Ž

Application/Control Number: 10/755,627

Art Unit: 3661

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on January 12, 2004 has been considered by the examiner. However, US patent applications 09/794,002 and 10/190,809 listed on the IDS have been replaced by their corresponding US patents 6,690,268 and 6,906,632, respectively. These patents are being listed on the attached PTO form 892.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., In re Berg, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 62-196 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-115 of U.S. Patent No. 6,678,614. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the mere rearranging of the claimed limitations does not make the claims of the present application

Application/Control Number: 10/755,627

Art Unit: 3661

patentably distinct over the claims of the abovementioned patent. Furthermore, it is well settled that the omission of an element, and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before (In re Karlson, 136 USPQ 184 (CCPA 1963)). Also note Ex parte Rainu, 168 USPQ 375 (Bd. App. 1969). Omission of a reference element of step whose function is not needed would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

6,975,215 Schofield et al Dec. 2005

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacques H. Louis-Jacques whose telephone number is 571-272-6962. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 5:30 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on 571-272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

· Application/Control Number: 10/755,627

Art Unit: 3661

Jacques H Louis-Jacques Primary Examiner Art Unit 3661

/jlj